



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

09/944,534

08/31/2001

Blake MingQi Dong

47013/PAN/S850

3296

23363 7590 09/16/2009
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP
PO BOX 7068
PASADENA, CA 91109-7068

EXAMINER

SALLIARD, SHANNON S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3628

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/16/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 09/944,534 | Applicant(s) DONG ET AL. | |
| | Examiner SHANNON S. SALIARD | Art Unit 3628 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 18 May 2009 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 18 May 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. Applicant argues, " From these quoted sections of Storace and a reading of Storace as a whole, it is evident that Storace does not disclose "the third party transferring a first portion of said expiring free postage value provided by the third party to a user's postage meter" and "storing a second portion of said expiring free postage value in a free postage account for the user at a third party PC postage provider server". It appears that the Applicant is arguing the references separately. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In this case,

Art Unit: 3628

the rejection of claim 1 is based on the combined teachings of Storace, Kara, and Yakal. Specifically Storace discloses transferring a first portion of postage value provided to a user's postage meter" and "storing a second portion of said postage value in a postage account for the user at a postage provider server [col 4, line 64-col 5, line 5; col 8, lines 1-8; col 2, lines 19-25]. Yakal also discloses a PC postage system that allows postage to be transferred to a user's computer [pg.1, para 2-4]. In addition, the Applicant has admitted that it is known that PC postage involves a third party having a central server location and that free postage is transferred to the user's meter [Applicant's specification at pg 2, lines 1-25]. Thus, the combination of Storace with Yakal teaches Applicant's invention.

4. Applicant argues " There is nothing in Kara that teaches or suggests the claimed feature of having free postage, much less any postage that will expire after a certain period time". However, Examiner disagrees. Kara discloses, "A postage meter must be adjusted, serviced and replenished manually...when the amount of postage programmed within the postage meter has expired, the postage in the meter must be replenished. To be replenished, a postage meter must be manually unplugged...and an employee must visit a U.S. Post Office to have the meter programmed with additional postage" [col 1, lines 46-55]. Although, Kara does not explicitly state that the postage expires after a period time, this feature is inherent in the disclosure of Kara since the meter had to take some arbitrary period of time before the postage was used up.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. **Claims 1-33 and 38** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-33 and 38 are directed to a series of steps. In order for a series of steps to be considered a proper process under § 101, a claimed process should either: (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials). *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972). Thus, to qualify as patent eligible, these processes must positively recite the other statutory class to which it is tied (e.g., by identifying the apparatus the accomplishes the method steps), or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed (e.g., by identifying the product or material that is changed to a different state). While claims -33 and 38 identify the apparatus as a server, nominal recitations of structure in an otherwise ineligible method fail to make the method a statutory process. See *Benson*, 409 U.S. at 71-72. As Comiskey recognized, "the mere use of the machine to collect data necessary for application of the mental process may not make the claim patentable subject matter." Incidental physical limitations, such as data gathering, field of use limitations, and post-solution activity are not enough to convert an abstract idea into a statutory process. In other words, nominal or token

Art Unit: 3628

recitations of structure in a method claim do not convert an otherwise ineligible claim into an eligible one. To permit such a practice would exalt form over substance and permit claim drafters to file the sort of process claims not contemplated by the case law. Cf., *Flook*, 437 U.S. at 593 (rejecting the respondent's assumption that "if a process application implements a principle in some specific fashion, it automatically falls within the patentable subject matter of § 101," because allowing such a result "would make the determination of patentable subject matter depend simply on the draftsman's art and would ill serve the principles underlying the prohibition against patents for 'ideas' or phenomena of nature."). *see Ex parte Langemyr*. Since the use of a server as written in the claim is considered to be a nominal recitation of structure, and nominal recitations do not convert an otherwise non-statutory process into a process, claims 1-33 and 38 are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 1, 21, 22, 24, 33, 34 and 36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over an article entitled, "Neopost's Simply Postage, the first PC-

based postage system to hit the retail market, is a winner” by Kathy Yakal (hereinafter referred to as ‘Yakal’) in view of Storace [US 4,864,506] and Kara [US 5,819,240].

As per **claim 1**, Yakal discloses the third party transferring a first portion of free postage value provided by the third party to a user’s postage meter [pg. 1, para 2-4; Applicant's spec at pg. 2, lines 1-25 also identifies that third party use in a PC postage system is well known].

Yakal does not disclose storing a second portion of said expiring free postage value in a free postage account for the user at a third party server; and resetting a balance of said free postage account for the user in the third party server upon expiration of said free postage value after the time period has elapsed.

However, Storace teaches a known technique of transferring a first portion of postage value to a user’s postage meter [col 4, line 64-col 5, line 5; col 8, lines 1-8]; and

storing a second portion of said postage value in a postage account [col 2, lines 19-25]. Storace does not explicitly disclose resetting a balance of said postage account for the user in the third part server upon expiration of said postage value after a time period has elapsed. However, Storace discloses replenishing a postage meter when necessary [col 2, lines 25-36; col 4, lines 35-37]. Furthermore, Kara discloses replenishing a postage meter account upon expiration of postage amount after a time period has elapsed [col 1, lines 46-51]. This known technique is applicable to the system of Storace as they both share the characteristics and capabilities, namely, the ability to transfer postage to a postage meter. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that applying the known technique of Storace would have yielded predictable

Art Unit: 3628

results and resulted in an improved system. It would have been recognized that applying the technique of Storace to the teachings of Yakal would have yielded predictable results because the level of ordinary skill in the art demonstrated by the references applied shows the ability to incorporate such transfer and storage features into similar systems. Further, applying a controlled way of distributing postage to Yakal would have been recognized by this of ordinary skill in the art resulting in an improved system that would encourage use of the PC postage system.

As per **claim 2**, Yakal does not further disclose further comprising the step of establishing minimum threshold for said postage meter and transferring a block of postage value from said free postage account to said postage meter when balance of said postage meter is less than or equal to said threshold. However, Storace further discloses further comprising the step of establishing minimum threshold for said postage meter and transferring a block of postage value from said free postage account to said postage meter when balance of said postage meter is less than or equal to said threshold [col 2, lines 15-31]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the PC postage system of Yakal the ability to transfer balances according to a threshold as taught by Storace since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per **claims 3, 22, 24, 34, and 36**, Yakal does not further disclose comprising the step of decrementing said postage account in accordance with said transferred postage value. However, Storace further discloses further comprising the step of

Art Unit: 3628

decrementing said postage account in accordance with said transferred postage value [col 11, lines 21-23]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the PC postage system of Yakal the ability to decrement the postage account as taught by Storace since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per **claim 9**, Yakal does not further disclose further comprising notifying user upon expiration of said free postage value. However, Storace discloses notifying the user that when there is no value left in the postage meter [col 6, lines 19-26].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Storace to include notifying user upon expiration of said free postage value so that the user is aware that there is not a mechanical issue.

As per **claim 10**, Yakal does not further disclose comprising the step of storing purchased postage value and balance of the postage meter in a descending register. However, Storace further discloses further comprising the step of storing purchased postage value and balance of the postage meter in a descending register [col 4, lines 35-42]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the PC postage system of Yakal the ability to store postage value in a descending register as taught by Storace since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per **claim 11**, Yakal does not further disclose comprising the step of decrementing said available postage field in accordance with a print transaction. However, Storace further discloses further comprising the step of decrementing said available postage field in accordance with a print transaction [col 6, lines 31-34]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the PC postage system of Yakal the ability to decrement said available postage field in accordance with a print transaction as taught by Storace since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per **claims 12 and 13**, Yakal does not further disclose comprising the steps of determining whether postage meter balance is equal to or greater than a predetermined threshold and transferring a block of free postage value from said free postage account to said postage meter in accordance with said threshold determination. However, Storace further discloses further comprising the steps of determining whether postage meter balance is equal to or greater than a predetermined threshold and transferring a block of free postage value from said free postage account to said postage meter in accordance with said threshold determination [col 2, lines 15-31]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the PC postage system of Yakal the ability to transfer postage value based on a threshold as taught by Storace since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per **claims 21 and 33**, Yakal discloses transferring a portion of said free postage value from a free postage account to a user's postage meter [pg. 1, para. 2-4].

Yakal does not disclose storing said postage value in a postage account for the user at a third party server; and transferring a portion of said postage value from postage account to a user's postage meter in accordance with a print postage request. However, Storace discloses storing said postage value in a postage account [col 2, lines 20-23]; and transferring a portion of said postage value from a postage account to a postage meter in accordance with a print postage request [col 5, line 34-col 6, line 36]. Storace does not explicitly disclose resetting a balance of said postage account upon expiration of said postage value after a time period. However, Storace discloses replenishing a postage meter when necessary [col 2, lines 25-36; col 4, lines 35-37]. Furthermore, Kara discloses replenishing a postage meter account upon expiration of postage amount after a time period [col 1, lines 46-51]. This known technique is applicable to the system of Storace as they both share the characteristics and capabilities, namely, the ability to transfer postage to a postage meter. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that applying the known technique of Storace would have yielded predictable results and resulted in an improved system. It would have been recognized that applying the technique of Storace to the teachings of Yakal would have yielded predictable results because the level of ordinary skill in the art demonstrated by the references applied shows the ability to incorporate such transfer and storage features into similar systems. Further, applying a controlled way of distributing postage to Yakal would have been recognized by this of ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 3628

art resulting in an improved system that would encourage use of the PC postage system.

9. **Claims 4, 5, and 25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over an article entitled, "Neopost's Simply Postage, the first PC-based postage system to hit the retail market, is a winner" by Kathy Yakal (hereinafter referred to as 'Yakal') in view of Storace [US 4,864,506] and Kara [US 5,819,240] as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Eddy et al [US 5,812,400].

As per **claim 4**, Yakal does not explicitly disclose further comprising the step of storing purchased postage value in an available postage account. However, Yakal discloses that the first amount of postage is free and that the user can also purchase postage in a PC account [pg. 1, para 4]. Thus, there is free postage and purchased postage available. Furthermore, Eddy et al discloses a postage meter containing two postage accounts and using the postage in the accounts based on prioritization [col 5, lines 14-22]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Yakal to include the step of utilizing said expiring free postage value before said purchased postage value to facilitate distinguishing between account usage.

As per **claims 5 and 25**, Yakal does not explicitly disclose further comprising the step of utilizing said expiring free postage value before said purchased postage value. However, Yakal discloses that the first amount of postage is free and that the user can also purchase postage in a PC account [pg. 1, para 4]. Thus, there is free postage and

Art Unit: 3628

purchased postage available. Furthermore, Eddy et al discloses a postage meter containing two postage accounts and using the postage in the accounts based on prioritization [col 5, lines 14-22]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Storace to include the step of utilizing said expiring free postage value before said purchased postage value so that the user is confident that he/she would like to continue to use the service (i.e., trial period).

10. **Claims 6-8, 23, and 35** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over an article entitled, "Neopost's Simply Postage, the first PC-based postage system to hit the retail market, is a winner" by Kathy Yakal (hereinafter referred to as 'Yakal') in view of Storace [US 4,864,506] and Kara [US 5,819,240] as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Official Notice.

As per **claim 6, 23, and 35**, Yakal does not further disclose further comprising the step of displaying a sum of total expiring free postage value and purchased postage value in an available postage field. However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known at the time of the invention in the postal industry to display the sum of available postage value in a postage meter. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Yakal to include the step of displaying a sum of total expiring free postage

value and purchased postage value in an available postage field so that the user knows when the account needs to be replenished.

As per **claim 7**, Yakal does not further disclose comprising the step of decrementing said available postage field in accordance with a print transaction. However, Storace further discloses further comprising the step of decrementing said available postage field in accordance with a print transaction [col 6, lines 31-34]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the PC postage system of Yakal the ability to decrement said available postage field in accordance with a print transaction as taught by Storace since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per **claim 8**, Yakal does not explicitly disclose comprising the step of utilizing said expiring free postage value before said purchased postage value. However, Yakal discloses that the first amount of postage is free [pg. 1, para 4]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Yakal to include the step of utilizing said expiring free postage value before said purchased postage value so that the user is confident that he/she would like to continue to use the service (i.e., trial period).

11. **Claims 14-20, 26-32, and 37** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over an article entitled, "Neopost's Simply Postage, the first PC-based postage system to hit the retail market, is a winner" by Kathy Yakal (hereinafter referred

Art Unit: 3628

to as 'Yakal') in view of Storace [US 4,864,506] and Kara [US 5,819,240] as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Leon [US 7,085,725].

As per **claims 14, 26 and 37**, Yakal does not disclose further comprising the steps of determining validity of said expiring free postage value in response to receipt of a print postage request and wherein said free postage account is reset in accordance with said validity determination. However, Leon discloses determining validity of a postage value in response to free postage print request and the account owner is given another amount of free postage value [col 14, line 36-col 16, line 50]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Yakal to include the method disclosed by Leon so that the postage provider does not lose revenue.

As per **claims 15 and 27**, Yakal does not disclose further comprising the step of determining whether balance of said free postage value is equal to or greater than a value of requested postage and transferring a block of free postage value from said free postage account to said postage meter in accordance with the amount determination. However, Storace discloses that when a meter reaches a threshold value the postage meter is re-credited from a postage account [col 2, lines 15-31]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Yakal to include the step of determining whether balance of said free postage value is equal to or greater than a value of requested postage and transferring a block of free postage value from said free postage account to said postage meter in

Art Unit: 3628

accordance with the amount determination. to provide a recharging system that is transparent to the postage meter user as suggested by Storace [col 2, lines 61-63].

As per **claims 16 and 28**, Yakal does not disclose comprising the step of decrementing said free postage account in accordance with the transferred postage. However, Storace further discloses further comprising the step of decrementing said free postage account in accordance with the transferred postage [col 11, lines 21-23]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the PC postage system of Yakal the ability to decrement said free postage account as taught by Storace since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per **claims 17 and 29**, Yakal does not disclose comprising the step of generating print image in accordance with said amount determination. However, Storace further discloses does not further disclose further comprising the step of generating print image in accordance with said amount determination [col 5, lines 38-41]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the PC postage system of Yakal the ability to generate a print image in accordance with said amount determination as taught by Storace since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per **claims 18-20, and 30-32**, Yakal does not disclose comprising the step of determining whether balance of total purchased postage value and free postage value

Art Unit: 3628

is equal to or greater than value of requested postage; generating error message in accordance with said amount determination; and/or generating print image in accordance with said amount determination. However, Storace discloses determining whether requested postage value is equal to a greater than account balance and generating an alert and/or generating a print image [col 6, lines 19-36]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Yakal to include determining whether balance of total purchased postage value and free postage value is equal to or greater than value of requested postage; generating error message in accordance with said amount determination; and/or generating print image in accordance with said amount determination so that the postage provider does not lose revenue.

12. **Claim 38** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leon [US 2002/0059145] in view of Fredman [US 6,526,393].

As per **claim 38**, Leon discloses receiving a request to print postage [0011]; and checking for postage value availability [determination of sufficient funds; 0011]. Leon does not further disclose generating an account to track free postage value separate from purchased postage value; checking for expiration of free postage value; and setting a balance of the account to zero when the free postage value has expired after a time period. However, Fredman discloses generating an account that monitors free postage value and purchased purchase value [plumber sets an account that is paid (i.e., free to user), but the value is returned if the user does not utilize the postage by an

Art Unit: 3628

expiration date (i.e., postage is purchased by user); col 4, line 29 –col 5, line 14].

Further it is inherent that the postage is checked for expiration since the plumber is refunded postage for items that are not mailed by a certain date. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Leon to include the method disclosed by Fredman to improve response times, lower prices, and improve customer experiences, as suggested by Fredman [col 7, lines 23-30].

13. **Claim 39** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leon [US 2002/0059145] in view of an article entitled, “Neopost’s Simply Postage, the first PC-based postage system to hit the retail market, is a winner” by Kathy Yakal (hereinafter referred to as ‘Yakal’) as applied to claim 38 above, and further in view of Eddy et al [US 5,812,400].

As per **claim 39**, Leon does not further disclose further comprising: applying available free postage value to the request to print postage if free postage value is available; and applying purchased postage to the request to print postage if free postage value is not available. However, Yakal discloses that the first amount of postage is free and that the user can also purchase postage in a PC account [pg. 1, para 4]. Thus, there is free postage and purchased postage available. Furthermore, Eddy et al discloses a postage meter containing two postage accounts and using the postage in the accounts based on prioritization [col 5, lines 14-22]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

Art Unit: 3628

the invention of Storace to include the step of utilizing said expiring free postage value before said purchased postage value so that the user is confident that he/she would like to continue to use the service (i.e., trial period).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHANNON S. SALIARD whose telephone number is (571)272-5587. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Please address mail to be delivered by the United States Postal Service (USPS) as follows:

Art Unit: 3628

***Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231***

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-5587 [Informal/ Draft Communications, labeled
“PROPOSED” or “DRAFT”]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the Customer Service Window,
Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314

Shannon S Saliard
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3628

/Shannon S Saliard/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3628